REMARKS

Receipt of the Office action of January 12, 2007 is hereby acknowledged. In that action the Examiner: 1) withdraws the restriction requirement between claims in Group I (claims 1-11) and Group II (claims 12-17 and 22-27); 2) rejects claims 1-2, 6 and 10 as allegedly anticipated by Horton (U.S. Pat. No. 5,969,770); 3) rejects claim 11 as allegedly unpatentable over Horton; 4) rejects claims 3-4, 7-9, 12, 16-17 and 22-27 as allegedly unpatentable over Horton in view of MacInnis et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,853,385); 5) rejects claim 5 as allegedly unpatentable over Horton in view of Chauvel et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,369,855) 6) rejects claim 13 as allegedly unpatentable over Horton and MacInnis futher in view of Yahav et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,057,909); 7) rejects claims 14 and 15 as allegedly unpatentable over Horton and MacInnis further in view of Callway et al. (Pub. No. 2003/0027517).

With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 12 and 22. Applicants believe the pending claims are allowable over the art of record and respectfully request reconsideration.

I. RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Applicants acknowledge the withdrawal of the restriction requirement between claims in Group I (claims 1-11) and Group II (claims 12-17 and 22-27) and thank the Examiner for consideration of claims 1-17 and 22-27. Applicants expressly elect Group II, claims 1-17 and 22-27.

II. AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

With respect to paragraph [0013], [0035], and [0036], Applicants present a plurality of amendments to correct grammatical shortcomings. No new matter is added.

III. 35 USC § 101 REJECTIONS

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants amend claim 1 to show a practical application which produces concrete, tangible and useful result.

Claim 1 specifically recites "**displaying the combined digital graphic object and digital picture**". Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claim 1 is directed towards a statutory subject matter under 35 USC 101. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claim 1.

IV. ART-BASED REJECTIONS

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Horton. Applicants amend claim 1 to more clearly define over Horton's overlay scheme. The amendment finds support in the original specification at Paragraphs [0034]-[0038], and [0040]-[0041].

Horton is directed to animated "on-screen" display provisions for an MPEG video signal processing system. (Horton Title). In particular, Horton appears to disclose an apparatus for providing OSD graphics (Horton Col. 2, lines 36-37). Horton teaches that prior to overlaying a graphics image with a video image, the graphics image is compressed (Horton Col. 8, lines 4-8). In particular, the graphics image is compressed by selectively including or excluding color difference components (i.e., chrominance value) for successive pixels, without allowing for the possibility of retaining partial values for each pixel. Specifically, for every two graphics pixels, the graphics image data converter selects the pair of color difference components for the first pixel and deletes the pair for the second pixel (Horton Col. 8, lines 8-11). Thus, Horton's overlay scheme is an unweighted overlay scheme wherein each pixel's chrominance value is either fully included or fully excluded.

Claim 1, by contrast, specifically recites, "combining a digital graphics object and a digital picture **using a weight factor based on a plurality of luminance values".** Applicants respectfully submit that Horton does not expressly or inherently teach such a system. Horton teaches an overlay scheme that fully includes or fully excludes each pixel's chrominance value. Thus, Horton fails to expressly or inherently teach "combining a digital graphics object and a digital picture **using a weight factor based on a plurality of luminance values".**

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and all claims which depend from claim 1 (claims 2-11), should be allowed.

B. Claim 12

Claim 12 stands rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Horton in view of MacInnis. Applicants amend claim 12 to more clearly define over the blending scheme of MacInnis. The amendment finds support in the original specification at Paragraphs [0034]-[0038], and [0040]-[0041].

Horton teaches an unweighted overlay scheme wherein each pixel's chrominance value is either fully included or fully excluded. As recognized within the Office Action, Horton does not teach a weighted overlay scheme.

MacInnis is directed to a video, audio and graphics decode, and composite display system. (MacInnis Title). In particular, MacInnis appears to disclose a graphics display system which includes blending of plurality of graphics images (col. 46, lines 57-63). Further still, MacInnis teaches using a composite alpha values during the blending of graphics image and the video.

In contrast to the teaching of Horton and MacInnis, claim 12 specifically recites, "wherein the processor, executing a program, overlays a digital graphics object and a digital picture **using a weight factor based on a color key**." Applicants respectfully submit that Horton and MacInnis do not teach or suggest such a system. Horton and MacInnis disclose blending graphics images and video using a composite alpha value. Thus, Horton and MacInnis fail to expressly or inherently teach "wherein the processor, executing a program, overlays a digital graphics object and a digital picture **using a weight factor based on a color key**."

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12, and all claims which depend from claim 12 (claims 13-17), should be allowed.

C. Claim 22

Claim 22 stands rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Horton in view of MacInnis. Applicants amend claim 22 to more clearly define over the blending scheme of MacInnis. The amendment finds support in the original specification at Paragraphs [0034]-[0038], and [0040]-[0041].

In contrast to the teaching of Horton and MacInnis, claim 22 specifically recites, "a computer readable media storing a program that, when executed by a processor, performs a method comprising overlaying a graphics object onto a picture **using a weight factor based on a color key**." Applicants respectfully submit that Horton and MacInnis do not teach or suggest such a computer readable media. Horton and MacInnis disclose blending graphics images and video using a composite alpha value. Thus, Horton and MacInnis fail to expressly or inherently teach "a computer readable media storing a program that, when executed by a processor, performs a method comprising overlaying a graphics object onto a picture **using a weight factor based on a color key**."

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22, and all claims which depend from claim 22 (claims 23-27), should be allowed.

V. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to the Texas Instruments, Inc. Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark E. Scott/

Mark E. Scott
PTO Reg. No. 43,100
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(512) 391-1900 (Phone)
(512) 320-9181 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants